

10/699,308
Examiner Amina S. Khan
Art Unit 1751

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered regarding pending claims 1-34 and 42-60. Claims 35-41 were previously canceled. No new claims are added. A Request for Continued Examination and a Petition and fee for a two-month extension of time accompanies this paper.

Claims 1, 3, 12, 15-17, 21, 23-24, 27, 34, 42, 46, 51-53 are amended. Support for amendment of claims is found in paragraphs 0032 through 0041 of the printed publication no. US 2005/0091756 A1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 27, 51, 54, 55 and 57-60 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Estes et al. (6,045,588), in view of Check (4,345,297). The USPTO maintains that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dry cleaning methods of Estes by incorporating into the apparatus the static electricity from dry cleaning fluids to prevent redeposition of soil particles in garments being cleaned in the solvent (column 1, lines 30-50).

Applicants amend claim 1 to recite that the structure of the automatic laundering apparatus which contacts the working fluid is formed from static dissipating compositions. The Check reference discloses a device designed to discharge an electrostatic field in a dry cleaning washer wherein such a device relies upon the use of an antenna containing a radioactive material. Embodiments of the present invention do not rely upon the use of a radioactive material, rather they uniquely rely upon the use of one or more non-radioactive static charge dissipating materials or systems (e.g. a static dissipating composition selected from a conductive polymer, a static charge dissipating coating, and a static charge dissipating shield).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 51, 54 and 55 under 35 USC §103(a).

10/699,308
Examiner Armina S. Khan
Art Unit 1751

Claims 1-4, 11 and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable by Estes et al. (6,045,588), as applied to the claims above, in view of Berndt et al (US6,059,845). The USPTO maintains that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the dry cleaning methods of Estes by incorporating into the apparatus the polyethylene chamber material.

Berndt et al. does not disclose a polymer composition that functions to dissipate static charge. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 51, 54 and 55 under 35 USC §103(a).

Claims 1-4, 16 and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Estes et al. (6,045,588), in view of Barnish et al (US3,477,259), the jamplast document ([www.jamplast.com/plastic data PP2.htm](http://www.jamplast.com/plastic%20data%20PP2.htm)) and Radomyselski (US2003/0226214). The USPTO maintains that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the dry cleaning methods of Estes by incorporating into the apparatus the polypropylene chamber of Barnish because Barnish teaches that the polypropylene tubs are preferred as washer tubs and have a high thermal degree of expansion compared to steel.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that polypropylene without an appropriate conductive additive does not significantly dissipate static charge. The Jamplast reference includes a polypropylene homopolymer "12MFR" but does not recite static dissipation properties. It is presumed that the polymer grades which show static dissipation properties include some type of appropriate static discharge material. Barnish teaches that the polypropylene tubs are preferred as washer tubs and have a high thermal degree of expansion compared to steel, however there is no suggestion in the Barnish reference to select a material other than polypropylene. As is well known, it is impermissible to use the Applicant's claimed invention as a blueprint for picking and choosing elements from multiple pieces of art and combining them to arrive at the claimed invention. Since such hindsight is impermissible, the present invention is nonobvious over the art made of record absent a specific showing of sufficient motivation to combine the art made of record.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-4, 16 and 51-53 under 35 USC §103(a).

10/699,308
Examiner Amina S. Khan
Art Unit 1751

Claim 34, 44, 45 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Estes et al. (6,045,588), Berndt et al. (US6,059,854), and Evers et al. (US 2003/0097718), as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Fyvie et al. (US2004/0117920). The USPTO maintains that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the cleaning methods taught by Estes et al., Berndt, and Evers et al. by incorporating the temperature, solvent/moisture, humidity and conductivity sensing steps as taught by Fyvie et al. because Fyvie teaches the utility of sensing the above mentioned parameters to provide more efficient cleaning of fabric articles.

Applicants submit that the Fyvie et al. reference discloses sensing moisture when the non-aqueous working fluid is washing the fabric load, but does not disclose sensing the initial moisture content of the fabric in the chamber of the laundering apparatus prior to adding working fluid to the chamber and optionally heating the fabric when the moisture content is above a predetermined quantity.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 34, 44, 45 and 49 under 35 USC §103(a).

Conclusion

In summary, Applicants believes that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007, and that Applicants' claims include features that patentably define over the cited references. It is respectfully requested that for the foregoing reasons claims 1-34, 42-60 of this application be found in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes there are any further matters, which need to be discussed in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

10/699,308
Examiner Amina S. Khan
Art Unit 1751

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0959, referencing our Docket No. US20030459 (094342.0033).

Respectfully submitted,
ROETZEL & ANDRESS

September 19, 2007
Date

Eileen T. Mathews
Eileen T. Mathews
Reg. No. 41,973
1375 E. Ninth Street
One Cleveland Center, Ninth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 623-0150 (reception)
(216) 623-0134 (facsimile)